



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/655,252	09/05/2000	Lee Cannon	IGT1P480X2/AG20-CIP	7732
79646	7590	03/06/2009		
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP - IGT Attn: IGT P.O. Box 70250 Oakland, CA 94612-0250			EXAMINER	
			COBURN, CORBETT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/06/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09655252	9/5/00	CANNON ET AL.	IGT1P480X2/AG20-CIP

EXAMINER

Corbett B.. Coburn

ART UNIT	PAPER
3714	20090302

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

1. Claims 85, 87 & 88 are cancelled. Appellant identified fewer than all of the rejected claims as being appealed in the status of claims section of the appeal brief. Therefore, the Office is considering this as an authorization to cancel the rejected claims that are not on appeal. See Ex parte Ghuman (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. May 1, 2008) and MPEP § 1215.03. Accordingly, the following claims are hereby canceled: 85, 87, and 88.

2. Please replace Section 6 of the Examiner's Answer as follows:

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is incorrect. Appellant refers to Deaton'485 instead of the Deaton'812 which was actually relied upon by the Examiner. Furthermore, Appellant did not mention the obviousness-type double patenting rejection outstanding in the case. The correct statement of the grounds of rejection is as follows:

Claims 48-50, 54, 55, 59-63, 78-84, 92-97 & 111-122 are rejected as obvious over Kelly et al. (US Patent Number 5,816,918) in view of Deaton et al. (US Patent Number 5,621,812).

Claims 48-50, 54-55, 57-84 & 90-126 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of Obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-48 of copending Application No. 10/353,689.

3. In Section (9) Grounds of Rejection, please delete all discussion of rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §112 (i.e., paragraphs 1-4). This refers claims that were canceled in an After Final Amendment & was inadvertently included in the Examiner's Answer.

Please change subparagraph (13) to state that "Claims 48-50, 54-55, 57-84 & 90-126 are rejected..."

4. Please add the following to the Examiner's Answer:

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

This section was inadvertently omitted.

5. The Information Disclosure Statements of 29 January 2009, 16 December 2008, and 11 December 2008 have been considered by the Examiner and are attached hereto.

Attached IDS: 1/29/09, 12/16/08, 12/11/08

/Corbett B. Coburn/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3714

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)